

A N
A N S W E R
T O
BARON DIMSDALE'S REVIEW, &c.



2

BARON DIMSDALE'S REVIEW, &c.

A N
A N S W E R
T O
BARON DIMSDALE'S REVIEW
O F
DR. LETTSOM'S OBSERVATIONS
O N T H E
BARON'S REMARKS RESPECTING A LETTER
U P O N
GENERAL INOCULATION.

BY JOHN COAKLEY LETTSOM, M. D.
F. R. S. and S. A.

“ J'étois devenu si fier et si vain, que je n'étois plus le fils de
“ mon père et de ma mère. La cour a la vertu du fleuve Léthé
“ pour nous faire oublier nos parens et nos amis.”

Gil Blas, L. 8. chap. xiii.

L O N D O N :

PRINTED FOR C. DILLY, IN THE-POULTRY; AND
H. PAYNE, PALL-MALL.

MDCCLXXIX.

A N S W E R

TO

BARON DIMSDALE'S REVIEW



DR. LITTLE

ON THE

BARON'S REMARKS RESPECTING A LETTER

" So may the sturdiest oak in the forest be cleft
" in twain by a wedge made of its own wood."

Hist. of John Bull.

BY JOHN COCKLEY LITTLE, M.D.

L. R. 2. and 3. A.

" I have given a list of the books which I have read, and the result of my reading is, that I have found the book to be a very good one, and I have no doubt that it will be found to be a very good one by all who read it."

L O N D O N

PRINTED FOR C. BISHOP, IN THE MOULTON, AND

H. BISHOP, LONDON.

MDCCCXXXII.

A N

A N S W E R

T O

BARON DIMSDALE'S REVIEW, &c.

WHEN I wrote my letter to Sir Robert Barker, and George Stackpoole, Esquire, in favour of the Society for General Inoculation, I well knew (as every one who had read his publications must know) that BARON DIMSDALE was a determined opponent of that Society: but as he was a person for whom I had really a regard, I thought it no superfluous civility to declare, that the part I took was taken from opinion only, not from any idea of contradiction to him. Without the least intention of deriving any importance to myself, I likewise casually mentioned the friendship which I supposed to subsist between us, and expressed my sentiments respecting his character; sentiments, indeed, which a man in his station must naturally wish to be entertained of him by the public in general, *viz.* that "he was a gentleman, and a skilful physician."

The BARON'S return for this instance of courtesy, was certainly not the most pleasing. In his

A

Remarks

Remarks on my *Letter*, the acquaintance I had claimed with him was disavowed in terms which the commonest penetration must perceive to indicate the most sovereign disdain of the claimant, as a person totally beneath notice. The imputation of falsehood, is an imputation in which no man of spirit can acquiesce. It became then my business, in some *Observations* on his *Remarks*, to shew that my acquaintance with him was such as I had asserted; nor was it thought unnecessary to hint at the probable causes which had so suddenly changed his civilities to me as a friend, into contempt as an almost stranger. The contents of my above-mentioned *Observations* have produced a *Review*, which is the present object of attention.

The first paragraph of this *Review* contains an apology for the BARON's afore said needless disavowal of my acquaintance; an apology, which is, indeed, a literary curiosity. Speaking of the unfortunate passage in my *Letter*, "To pass it over," says he, "might have been deemed negligent or *uncivil*, or construed into a fondness of praise, which, being professedly built upon an intimacy supposed to subsist between Dr. Letterson and myself, I was conscious could not be just: As I found myself unable to return the compliment, and sincerely disliked *such kind of incense*, I made use of some expressions, which I own were designed to shew that dislike, but without the least intention of exciting Dr. Letterson's anger."

BARON DIMSDALE's idea of civility, it must be owned, is somewhat peculiar. Supposing a person had expressed himself concerning me in a manner which I could not entirely approve, if, nevertheless, I were inclined to shew such person civility,
I should

I should imagine that civility more properly shewn by a silent negligence, than by charging him with falsehood even in the obliquest manner.

That BARON DIMSDALE's delicacy should be so extremely shocked at the thought of being suspected of a fondness for praise, may, to some, seem rather extraordinary ; but his declaration that the praise which I gave him, whether liked or disliked, *could not be just, because* it was founded on a supposed intimacy between us, is more extraordinary still. I asserted, that BARON DIMSDALE was a gentleman and a discerning physician ; but my assertion could not alter the fact one way or the other. If he really was not so, my praise was undoubtedly unjust ; if he really was so, my praise, on whatever it was *built*, whether popular opinion or personal intimacy, was as undoubtedly bestowed with justice. The BARON, however, has here drawn once more a conclusion against himself * : I praised him as a gentleman and a discerning physician ; my praise, he declares, he was conscious could not be just ; he, therefore, must be conscious he has no title to the honour of those characters. He seems willing, however, that his antagonist should rank in the same predicament ; and by telling me that he is " unable to return my compliment," pretty plainly hints his opinion of my pretensions to the possession of gentility and discernment. His dislike of "*such kind of incense*" as mine, might probably be sincere ; some persons will accept the wreath from one hand, and not from another ; per-

* See *Remarks*, p. 16. where he declares my character of him as a gentleman and a man of discernment, to be "lavish and ill-founded."

haps he declines accepting it from any he deems his inferiors *.

Whether or no, by expressing his dislike, he designed to excite my anger, is a point I do not pretend to decide; but he must naturally suppose the man endued with an uncommon portion of apathy or patience, who would not be displeased at being placed in the most degrading situation in which it was possible to place him; that of a person, whose acquaintance could not possibly be acknowledged.

He observes that the distribution of his *Remarks* among his friends, and his advertising them to be left at coffee-houses for public inspection, seems to have given offence to me, and, as he thinks, without reason; his proceedings in this respect, could give me offence so far only as my own reputation was concerned. If his disavowal of our acquaintance was an injury, the further that injury was extended by an industrious circulation, the greater was the occasion for offence.

My two pages of criticism on the paragraph in which he disclaims my acquaintance, he says, he shall pass over without reply. It is doubtless most prudent to pass over what he finds himself unable to answer.

He now proceeds to examine the evidence I adduced to prove that our acquaintance was not so superficial as it had been represented by him.

"The first instance given," says he, "is our joint attendance on a patient in White-hart Court, where the Doctor thinks our visits must sometimes have exceeded an hour. At this patient's

* Pope says of the famous Duke of Wharton, that he could not be contented without the praise of fools and women. Perhaps BARON DIMSDALE will not be contented with any praise but from the mouths of nobles and princes.

“ (a gentlewoman for whom I had a particular regard) I met Dr. Lettsom in company with another physician, I believe, three times; the duration of our visits was proportioned to the importance of the case, but no conversation passed but what immediately related to it; so that this very well coincides with what I have said “ that mutual civilities have passed the very few times we have had occasion to meet. *”

The above-mentioned patient was my wife's sister, and her husband was partner in the banking business with the BARON. Connections of this nature must necessarily produce some degree of intimacy. That no conversation passed at the medical visits but what immediately related to the case, is indeed probable; but as the BARON and myself were both frequently at the house, our interviews were not confined to that occasion, or the duration of them limited to the usual time of a consultation †.

“ The next instance produced,” says he, “ is of the Doctor's dining with me at my house in Hertford in 1773, to introduce a kinsman of his to my family:” there he acknowledges his want of recollection. “ This,” he adds, “ is certainly true; I did not recollect it.”

“ The last,” he says, “ is, that Dr. Lettsom dined with me in company with the Russian ambassador, and some other gentlemen in 1774. This

* *Review*, p. 3.

† At this house the BARON sometimes employed himself in answering the letters of his foreign correspondents, and that in a language wherein I apprehend he could not express himself with the greatest facility. This is a circumstance I could not have known, had I been the stranger to him and his concerns that he wishes to represent me.

“ I well

“ I well remember *; it was towards the end of
 “ July 1774, when Dr. Lettsom sent for me to an
 “ inn in Hertford, and expressed a desire to see
 “ *Omiab*, who was then inoculated under my care.
 “ I invited the Doctor to favour me with his com-
 “ pany to dinner. Many questions were asked at
 “ this meeting by the Doctor relative to this na-
 “ tive of *Ulatea*, but little did we apprehend for
 “ what purpose. However, I was soon after ral-
 “ lied by one of the company on the retentive me-
 “ mory of the inquisitive friend I had introduced,
 “ who in the short time spent with us, had collect-
 “ ed many anecdotes of *Omiab*, and without the
 “ least apology, furnished a monthly publication
 “ with a long letter reciting the conversation that
 “ had passed at my table †.”

That I sent for BARON DIMSDALE to an inn, is a circumstance I do not recollect; but if I really took that liberty, it must have been taken on the presumption that it was authorised by a former intimacy ‡. This I do recollect, that an obliging gentleman of Hertford accompanied me to *Omiab*'s lodgings, where my conference with the native of *Ulatea* was supported by the aid of an interpreter. Partly by this means, and partly from the common discourse of the day, I obtained the anecdotes which the BARON charges me with obtaining at his table; and which I thought might prove en-

* “ This I well remember.” In a manuscript copy of this *Review* communicated to me by himself, he says, “ *This I shall never forget.*” I leave the reader to make his own comment on this alteration.

† *Review*, p. 6.

‡ There was no occasion to apply to BARON DIMSDALE for a sight of *Omiab*. He walked frequently about the town, and several times passed the inn where I had alighted, during the short time I was there.

tertaining to those whose curiosity was excited by the arrival of this famous foreigner. To shew with what justice I am accused of reciting the conversation at BARON DIMSDALE's table, I shall insert at the end of this work an entire copy of the long letter he refers to *, cheerfully submitting my conduct to the impartial examination of that Public, whom I innocently meant to amuse and inform. That it was a crime to mention BARON DIMSDALE's name in print without his leave, or that he claimed an exclusive monopoly of the words and actions of *Omiiah*, I did not know; but that, by my procedure in this matter, the BARON was more than a little irritated, is sufficiently evident from the whole tenor of the above-quoted paragraph, the suppression whereof might perhaps have been an act of prudence.

My noble antagonist seems much surprised, that I should consider the introduction of his son to a medical consultation, as an improper intrusion. "To several physicians" says he, "of the first rank in this metropolis, with whom I pretend to no particular friendship, I have used no other introduction on such occasions, than,—Sir, this is my son;—and without a single exception, he has been invited to be present at our consultations. Such are the liberal sentiments that accompany the man of education and the gentleman †."

Among the faculty, I believe it is generally understood as an uncommon and improper step to introduce a third person to a medical consultation, unrequested by the patient or his family. There

* Appendix.

† Review, p. 7.

could be no magic in the words, "Sir, this is my son," that could render it otherwise in the cases above specified. The physicians, who on so broad a hint from the father invited the son to be present, might be very sensible of the impropriety of that hint, but considering the popular character of the father, could not omit the invitation without appearing deficient in common civility.

"But Dr. Lettsom," observes the BARON, "to my great surprise, infers from this a considerable degree of friendship and freedom, adding, 'my regard for him made me overlook small punctilios, and cheerfully acquiesce in any thing which he thought might promote the interest of his family *.'" *Review*

A proceeding of the kind in question, contrary to an established etiquette of the profession, though I admit it no certain criterion of friendship, must undoubtedly be an instance of great freedom taken both with the other physicians and with me. I could not, as above hinted, object to it consistently with common politeness; but could I have so objected (whatever might be my private thoughts of the matter abstractedly considered) I should not; because I wished to *acquiesce in any thing which the BARON thought might promote the interest of his family.*

To me, the ceremonious introduction of—"Sir, this is my son," was indeed unnecessary; I was personally acquainted with the son; I then respected him, I do still respect him; we have had no difference, nor do I mean to reflect on him in any thing that may be said on the present occasion.

The BARON's ostentatious display of his son's

* *Review*, p. 7.

education and experience, had surely been as well omitted: "That the Doctor may not feel himself too much degraded, I will tell him, that this son of mine had been four successive years a regular student in Edinburgh; attended the lectures of the several professors, and after having passed through the usual examinations, took his degree of Doctor of Physic where he had studied; and further, the disease we attended together was the smallpox, and I believe this young man had seen more patients under that distemper than Dr. Lettsom then had, or probably may do as long as he lives*."

The insinuation that I felt myself degraded on the above occasion, is groundless; whatever may be the case with others, I never thought myself degraded by connections with an equal, or even with a reputable inferior, nor ever thought of superciliously disclaiming their acquaintance. The education mentioned by BARON DIMSDALE, is no more than is, or ought to be, the education of every regular physician; but perhaps the history of his son's medical studies was given as the history of a novelty in the family. The eulogium, concerning matter of experience, seems founded on too implicit a belief in one respect, and a too vague probability in the other. Had the BARON considered the length of time I have been employed in a public institution, in which thousands of patients come annually under my care, he would have spoken of the past with more modesty and reserve; and as to the future, he should have remembered that future events are inscrutable.

"In another paragraph," says he, "I am attack-

* *Review*, p. 7, 8.

“ ed on the declaration that we never had any
 “ epistolary correspondence, which, without Dr.
 “ Lettsom’s being able to produce a single instance,
 “ is concluded by saying, ‘ that we neither of us
 “ had much leisure for writing, but that letters
 “ have passed between us, I can safely assert *.”

Acquaintance, and even intimacy, frequently
 subsist, when a literary correspondence does not.
 A correspondence, therefore, would not have been
 produced as a proof of intimacy, had not BARON
 DIMSDALE positively declared that none ever
 existed between us †. I am unfortunately unable
 to produce a single letter of the BARON’S, but it
 was to an act of friendship to him that I owe the
 inability. Copies of my own letters I rarely pre-
 serve. Letters of my friends when the subject does
 not require preservation I usually destroy, espe-
 cially such as would discredit the writer; were
 they to fall into improper hands. The two last
 letters ‡ I received from BARON DIMSDALE, were
 on a subject of a public nature, in which others
 were interested, and to others, consequently, I was
 obliged to communicate them. Those to whom
 they were shewn, appeared so disgusted at the con-
 tents, particularly the almost perpetual repetition
 of his titular appellation of BARON, that I was de-
 termined they should not remain in existence to
 his disgrace. This circumstance there are persons
 ready to testify. And here the remark may not be
 impertinent, that it seems somewhat wonderful that

* *Review of Dr. Lettsom’s Observations*, p. 8.

† *Remarks on a Letter*, p. 16.

‡ This is to be understood as prior to the BARON’S first attack
 in his *Remarks on my Letter*. Since that period our correspond-
 ence has been considerably enlarged, having had the honour of
 receiving several letters from him.

the man who is so fond of an empty title when appropriated by himself *, should be so provoked at being credited with the real character of a gentleman by another, as publicly to disclaim both the attribute and the attributer.

BARON DIMSDALE now " requests the reader " to determine whether the intercourse between " Dr. L. and himself, bears the appearance of a long " and intimate friendship. † " To the determination of the reader on this point, I readily submit. I never was absurd enough to pretend, that our friendship was a counterpart to the friendships of antiquity, or even that it amounted to a very strict intimacy. I never wished it to be thought more than I myself really thought it ; a courteous intercourse, accompanied with some degree of confidence between two acquaintance on equal terms. But I must own I did not like to be disclaimed as an almost unknown, and, by implication, uncharacterised inferior.

He terms this contest about our supposed intimacy, ridiculous ‡ : he is requested to recollect from what it originated, and to ask himself whether it did not originate from a superlative degree of pride, not only ridiculous but contemptible || ?

* See also the titles of his printed works,——*Body Physician and actual Counsellor of State to the Autocratrix of all the Russias. The Honourable, &c. &c.*

† *Review of Dr. Lettsom's Observations*, p. 9.

‡ *Ibid.*

|| Should it be retorted, that my resentment of the BARON's paragraph must proceed from pride ; I reply, that it proceeded from a different and more important motive. My paragraph and his cannot rank in one predicament ; mine was a compliment, his a disavowal ; mine could not possibly injure him, his must necessarily injure me wherever I was not known.

He now quotes * a passage from my observations: "Private character is almost to every man of more or less importance, but to a physician it is of the greatest; the defence of private character in the case of a physician, must therefore be admitted as an apology sufficiently valid." "Would any one," says he, "believe that the inditer of these sentiments could so far forget himself as to asperse the character of another, whom he had before lavishly praised, and that for no other reason, but his not entertaining the same idea of the friendship subsisting between them as himself †?"

That I have aspersed the character of **BARON DIMSDALE**, remains to be proved; but supposing I had, it would have been not for his entertaining an idea of our friendship different from my own, but for his treating me with arrogance and contempt, as an insolent pretender to connections with my superiors which did not subsist.

To prove that I have aspersed his character, he proceeds as follows: "Dr. Lettsom has, without the least foundation, and against all appearances, admitted a suspicion that he had given me offence by his visits to Hertford, and particularly on account of his having met in consultation, and contracted a friendship with, another physician in that neighbourhood. In support of these opinions he has very unwarrantably thrown out reflections against me, equally groundless, injurious, and untrue.

"I can make great allowances for a heated ima-

* *Review*, p. 9, 10.

† **BARON DIMSDALE** here admits that he did not entertain the same idea of our friendship as myself; my idea was, that it was real. What then is the inference?

"gination,

“ gination, but none for a person who can de-
 “ liberately and falsely attack the character of
 “ another. Yet such is the light the Doctor must
 “ appear in to any one, who reads and attends to
 “ what follows.

“ For brevity sake I shall make few quotations,
 “ but shall refer the reader to the Doctor’s rela-
 “ tion of his visits to Hertford in the year 1778,
 “ beginning where his suspicions are first noticed.
 “ * Perhaps I was treading on interdicted ground’
 —“ Entrance on the precincts of the Baron’s me-
 “ dical domain, might possibly be a trespass not
 “ easy to be forgiven.’

“ Yet it seems, by his own account, that when
 “ he waited on me this disgust was artfully con-
 “ cealed. ‘ † If he had really then any disgust at
 “ my abovementioned attendance with Dr. Wal-
 “ ley, the emotions of it were so carefully sup-
 “ pressed that no appearance of it could be dis-
 “ covered; such unreservedness, on the contrary,
 “ prevailed in his behaviour, as tended to heighten
 “ my ideas of the sincerity and ardour of his
 “ friendship.’

“ And at his third and last visit, it seems, the
 “ hypocrisy was carried still further.

“ ‡ Notwithstanding the discourse that had
 “ passed betwixt us on Inoculation, no marks of
 “ distance or disgust were perceptible in his con-
 “ duct; far indeed from any thing of that kind,
 “ he favoured me with what must at least bear the
 “ resemblance of a more than common respect.
 “ He had a patient, he said, a child with whose
 “ parents I was acquainted, on whose case he
 “ wished me to be consulted, and had accordingly

* Page 17.

† Page 21.

‡ Page 26.

“ sent to apprise the family of my arrival. He
 “ then pressed me to dine with him, in company
 “ with the friends of his abovementioned patient;
 “ and my prior engagement only prevented me
 “ from complying with his apparently kind invitation.
 “ tation.’

“ The reader is desired to observe, that Dr.
 “ Lettsom has paid me the compliment of having,
 “ during this intercourse, concealed the rancour
 “ of an envious heart under the mask of
 “ friendship. If this be true, I am contented to
 “ be esteemed infamous. If the charge be false, I
 “ leave to others the delineation of the character
 “ of the detractor.” *

Surprised as I was at the sudden transition in BARON DIMSDALE’S behaviour, from the greatest courtesy to evident disgust, and not conceiving that the compliment paid him in my letter to Sir Robert Barker, &c. could possibly be the sole cause of that transition, it was natural to seek some other. Conjectures or suspicions offered themselves, but they were expressed with caution, and even if justly founded, would not affect his character as aspersions, without it were a dishonour for one man to be offended at the conduct of another. That these conjectures or suppositions, however, were not justly founded, he has not proved, nor can prove without his own word is admitted as valid evidence.

The grievance, however, lies here: That I should suppose him at all privately displeased, while he openly discovered no tokens of displeasure. This idea he expresses in the strong terms of concealing the “ rancour of an envious heart under the mask

* *Review*, p. 10, 11, 12.

"of friendship. If this," says he, "be true, I am contented to be esteemed infamous." * He has here proposed a test of his own character, and if it be established, he must abide the consequence. "If the charge be false," says he, "I leave to others the delineation of the character of the detractor †." I made no positive charge true or false, and therefore cannot properly be accused of detraction ‡.

Whether or not BARON DIMSDALE had conceived disgust at my visiting a patient in Hertford; at my commencing an acquaintance with Dr. Waller; or from my conversation with himself on Inoculation; it seems pretty clear, he had conceived disgust against me long ago on another occasion. This was respecting the affair of *Omiab* already mentioned. My conduct in that affair, supposing his account of it to be true ||, it must have been impossible for him not to resent; and even supposing his account of it to be false, his own words plainly evince that it was resented, and remembered with resentment to the present moment. "This," says he, "*I well remember.*" In his manuscript of the *Review* communicated to me, "This," says he, "*I shall never forget.*" Now as after this, he treated me with much civility, and invited me to that table where I had so grossly offended; though I will not state the matter in his own strong terms of "*concealing the rancour of an envious heart under the mask of friendship,*" yet

* *Review*, p. 12.

† *Ibid.*

‡ For instance, when I said, *perhaps I was treading on interdicted ground*, I said also (which BARON DIMSDALE has omitted to quote) *perhaps I was not*.

|| *Viz.* That I had recited in print the conversation at his table. The reader will mark that this was in 1774, five years ago.

he must excuse me in thinking his behaviour evinced no great degree of sincerity, and that he would have acted prudently in not proposing the above test of his own character.

To prove that my abovementioned conjectures, however natural, were wrong, **BARON DIMSDALE** introduces the following curious passage.

“ The fact stands simply thus :

“ Before Dr. Lettsom was called to the patient
 “ at Hertford, I had been requested by a young
 “ gentlewoman, daughter to the patient in ques-
 “ tion, to visit her mother, and on excusing my-
 “ self, because I wished to decline practice, and
 “ never met the physician who attended, she men-
 “ tioned her thoughts of desiring the attendance
 “ of Dr. Lettsom. This proposal I very much en-
 “ couraged, and I believe it was on the second
 “ visit, that, hearing the Doctor was at Hertford,
 “ I requested to speak with him, and he called at
 “ my house. He knows very well, that I wished
 “ to communicate to him some information that I
 “ thought would enable him to take the part of a
 “ friend, as well as of a physician, in a family that
 “ I had many years known, and greatly respected.
 “ The conversation that I have recited then fol-
 “ lowed, without the least injunction of secrecy,
 “ which could not be implied in a discourse upon a
 “ topic so general and public ; for which reason I
 “ think myself fully justified in publishing it,
 “ though I do not wonder that the Doctor had ra-
 “ ther not have been reminded of what he then
 “ said.

“ I think this true relation of my having con-
 “ tributed to the Doctor's visiting the patient,
 “ knowing that he was to meet Dr. Walley, will
 “ sufficiently prove that I was neither averse from,
 nor

“ nor offended at, the measure; but to make the
 “ point clear beyond a doubt, I must tell the Doc-
 “ tor, that I have for some years wished to decline
 “ practice, have, as occasion offered, made it known,
 “ and sometimes have been absent from Hertford
 “ for four or five months together; determining,
 “ however, not absolutely to refuse visiting either
 “ rich or poor, wherever I may be situated, and
 “ when such visits are particularly desired *.”

To prove the affirmative or negative of a mere conjecture, is in some circumstances no easy task.— If I have not been able to prove the one in the case in question, I believe it must be allowed, BARON DIMSDALE has not very satisfactorily proved the other.—In what manner, or to what degree, he encouraged the proposal for calling me to the patient at Hertford, he has not specified: I shall only remark, that I know not how he could have discouraged it with decency †. But it may be further observed, that it seems very extraordinary he should esteem that identical person proper “ to
 “ take the part of a friend, as well as physician, in
 “ a family he had many years known and greatly re-
 “ spected,” whom in a few months after he affected to reprobate in public print as a person of whom he had scarcely any knowledge. The reader, who compares the above-quoted passage, with his disavowal of me in his *Remarks* ‡, the “ *slight ac-
 “ quaintance subsisting between us,*” the “ *mutual
 “ civilities that have passed the very few times we*

* *Review*, p. 12, 13, 14.

† I did not owe my introduction to this family to the BARON: the daughter, who resided in London, and had long been my patient, introduced me to her mother.

‡ *Remarks*, p. 16.

"have met," and the "only hour we have spent together," must surely impute such inconsistency to a memory too treacherous to be trusted on the most trifling occasions, or to something much worse, to deliberate wilful misapprehension, or intentional falsehood.

BARON DIMSDALE thinks himself fully justified in publishing our discourse on Inoculation, because it was a topic of public and general concern: by parity of reason, I might have thought myself justified in doing what he says I did, in publishing the discourse at his table on *Omiat*, a topic not at all of a more private nature. He thinks his having contributed to my visiting the abovementioned patient, knowing at the same time that I was to meet Dr. Walley, sufficiently proves that he was neither averse to the measure, nor offended at it: there is no evidence, but his own assertion, that he contributed to my visits, and in case there were, there is no necessity for the conclusion. Situations alter circumstances, and the situation in question might be such, that he could not in appearance but concur with a proceeding, which might in reality be not the most pleasing.

But to make the point clear beyond a doubt, viz. that he was not offended at my visiting the patient, and meeting Dr. Walley, he says, "he must tell me that he has for some years *wished to decline practice*, has, as occasion offered, made it known, and has sometimes been absent from Hertford four or five months together; *determining however not absolutely to refuse visiting either rich or poor*, wherever he may be situated, *when such visits are particularly desired.*" This seems, however, so far from making the point clear, that it involves it in tenfold perplexity.

Had

Had he indeed totally declined business, he could not have been angry at my visiting the patient; but still he might have been angry at my meeting a person, with whom he was not on good terms; and if he had been on good terms with Dr. Walley, why did he never meet him as a physician? But there is somewhat further in this passage worthy notice. That a person should *wish to decline a thing*, and at the same time take such steps as must render *the declining it impossible*, is really unaccountable. The man surely could not seriously *propose to relinquish practice*, who *determined to attend when he was desired* *. Physicians, as I apprehend, never attend but when they are sent for; what the BARON therefore means, by particularly desiring his attendance, I leave to himself to explain. But that he sometimes departed from this determination, not to refuse visiting rich or poor, when *particularly desired*, is evident. He was, according to his own account, *particularly desired* to visit the abovementioned patient by her own daughter, but refused. But he excused himself, because he wished to decline practice. This was a curious reason indeed! If he *wished* to decline practice, why did he make a determination not to decline it? If he thought proper to make such a determination, why did he not adhere to it uniformly in one case as well as another? But

* In consequence of BARON DIMSDALE's *supposed intentions* of resigning practice, several physicians successively attempted to settle at Hertford, and were regularly undeceived by his conduct. One gentleman of my acquaintance, after many endeavours, procured an explanation from the BARON, of what he really meant by resigning practice; which explanation was, that he would attend rich and poor when sent for. Satisfied with this, the gentleman left the town, and now resides in a capital city, where his merits were no sooner known than rewarded.

there was in this case a cause for exception: he never met the physician * who attended. Before his determination had been made, he should have considered that Dr. Walley was in extensive practice, in which there must frequently occur cases to require consultation; consequently, that in not resigning to some other gentleman who would meet the Doctor, he was, for his own caprice, subjecting the country to almost insuperable difficulties. But what can be said of a man whose assertions, compared with his conduct, form a complete paradox? Why he never met Dr. Walley, is a subject that remains for discussion.

His next paragraph consists solely of assurances, that I was not treading on interdicted ground; that he was glad I visited the aforesaid patient; that he was never jealous or displeased at my connection with Dr. Walley; that he was perfectly sincere in all he said to me; that I should have met with a hearty welcome, if I had accepted his invitation to dinner the last time I was at Hertford†; and that there is no character he holds so despicable, as that which is distinguished by falsehood and hypocrisy. The validity of these assurances, depending solely on his own veracity, they need no examination or comment. Whatever may be said in such cases, the world will still think as it pleases.

“ With respect to the child, in whose case I wished him to be consulted—it was simply this:

“ The child was dangerously ill, and I should have been glad to have had the assistance of *any* physician, of whose abilities I entertained a good opinion, who had happened to have been on the spot: and with a double propriety in this case,

* Dr. Walley.

† *Review*, p. 14.

“ because

“ because Dr. Lettsom was intimately acquainted
 “ with the parents, who were then at Hertford.
 “ Surely this cannot be esteemed more than com-
 “ mon respect *.”

With his usual consistency of sentiment he here implicitly acknowledges, that he entertained a good opinion of my medical abilities, though before, when I credited him with entertaining a good opinion of his own, he declared himself “ unable to return the compliment †.” But he says, he should have been glad to have had the assistance of any physician, of whose abilities he entertained a good opinion, who had happened to have been on the spot. How does this declaration operate with regard to Dr. Walley? Dr. Walley was on the spot—will BARON DIMSDALE say, that he has not a good opinion of Dr. Walley’s medical abilities?

We are now come to one of the most important parts of the *Review*.

“ Thus much for the visits to Hertford; but I
 “ must not part with the Doctor, without denying
 “ the untruths he has asserted of me respecting Dr.
 “ Walley, whose name he has frequently intro-
 “ duced without any apparent purpose. In page 22.
 “ he says, ‘ during the few minutes we passed to-
 “ gether, he introduced the circumstances of a
 “ dispute between himself and Dr. Walley.’ And
 “ page 17. ‘ but with Dr. Walley, though perhaps
 “ not his inferior in education, learning, reputa-
 “ tion, or extent of practice, the Baron, from
 “ motives of private animosity, had always refused
 “ to consult.’

“ With regard to the first assertion, it is cer-

* *Review*, p. 15.

† *Ibid.* p. 3.

“ tainly

" tainly mistaken ; for I never had a dispute of any
 " kind with Dr. Walley in my life.

" How he became acquainted with my private
 " animosity, remains for him to explain. I can
 " only say, no charge can be more groundless. Dr.
 " Walley and I do not meet as physicians ; but, as
 " to private animosity, it is so far from being true,
 " with respect to myself, that I should be ex-
 " tremely ready to do Dr. Walley any good office,
 " and I verily believe he would as willingly assist
 " me, if requested *."

I should be very sorry to introduce Dr. Walley's name in any publication of mine, in a manner which he might disapprove. My *Observations* were communicated to him in manuscript, and returned without objection †. With regard to the word *dispute*, when I used it, I did not attend so much to the precise signification, as to the general lax idea, which I thought it might serve to convey. I did not mean to insinuate, that there had been between BARON DIMSDALE and Dr. Walley, a series of altercations in public company, a literary controversy, a law suit, or a duel. So far as my expression may be deemed to intend any of these, I stand corrected, and am ready to retract it. By the word dispute (though not with the strictest propriety), I meant a variance, or misunderstanding-

* *Review*, p. 15, 16.

† The manuscript of my *Observations* was sent also to BARON DIMSDALE, submitting it to his correction, with a declaration that I wished to obtain justice only on the ground of truth. Then was his time to have objected to it, if he had objected at all. It is true he made an objection to one passage, which was in consequence altered. If he knew that any other parts of the contents were untrue, it was ungenerous not to inform me of them, but, on the contrary, to suffer me to expose myself by publishing falsehoods.

ing; and that something of that nature has subsisted between BARON DIMSDALE and Dr. Walley for many years past, is too well known to a considerable part of the county of Hertford, to admit of denial *.

Were other evidence, however, wanting, their not meeting as physicians is proof sufficient. There is no other physician in that part of the country wherein they reside; there must therefore be some important reason for such singular conduct. BARON DIMSDALE has owned that the refusal to meet is on his part †, and for the cause of that refusal there seems to be only two ultimate alternatives; a distrust or disapprobation of Dr. Walley's medical abilities, or the existence of a personal difference or dislike. The first, allowing the competence of BARON DIMSDALE's judgment, is a supposition, which, from Dr. Walley's universal high character in the line of his profession, will not be admitted. The second therefore must be the fact, without BARON DIMSDALE can produce a third; and if he can, it is incumbent upon him to produce it. The strength of this personal dislike may perhaps be not unjustly estimated, by his refusing to consult with Dr. Walley when *particularly desired by a family he had long known and re-*

* It is well known that some years ago the abovementioned gentlemen often met in public, without exchanging the usual forms of salutation, or taking the least notice of each other. About the same time an excellent epigram appeared in the public papers, which was generally attributed to Dr. Walley, and not disavowed by him. Whatever provocation I may have received, I have no intention unnecessarily to degrade BARON DIMSDALE; I therefore *will not* reprint this epigram.

† See *Review* p. 13. where he says, on excusing myself, because I wished to decline practice, and *never* met the physician who attended,

specter,

spected, and *encouraging* that family to incur the extraordinary trouble and expense of sending to London for a man who had offended at his table respecting *Omiáh*, and to whom he could not afterwards return a compliment, because of the *very slight acquaintance* which subsisted between them *.

The charge of private animosity, than which BARON DIMSDALE says, "*no charge can be more groundless*," seems pretty well established by the above; nor does there need any other explanation how I became apprized that such animosity existed. Were it necessary to say more, I could say that I had the knowledge of it from himself. When we were last together, he introduced the circumstance of what I will not term, as I inadvertently termed it before, a *dispute*, but a misunderstanding or variance, or something to the same effect. In fact, he said that Dr. Walley and himself never met as physicians, but that they treated each other in public with politeness. How far the indulgence of such a private disgust as will not permit two physicians to meet on consultation, and the maintenance of an external civility at the same time, are compatible with a mind that "does not conceal ill-will under the mask of friendship, and despises no character so much as that which is distinguished by falsehood and hypocrisy †," I leave to the reader to determine.

* One man cannot know another man's thoughts, but he may *conjecture* what they might probably be, on such and such occasions. In the present case, BARON DIMSDALE might think in this manner—A consultation must be had, and therefore, though I am not very fond of Lettson, yet I had rather he should come to consult with Walley, for I will prefer even that alternative to consulting with Walley myself.

† *Review*, p. 14.

That

That Dr. Walley would give BARON DIMSDALE any assistance that he could give with propriety, from what I know of his candid and generous disposition, I can readily believe; but that BARON DIMSDALE *would be*, or at least *has been* ready, to do Dr. Walley *good offices*, I must doubt, since his refusing to meet him as a physician, far from being a *good office*, must be a real and extensive injury*.

BARON DIMSDALE's obliging proffer of good offices to Dr. Walley, considering the general idea that has been long entertained, in Hertfordshire, of the situation of these gentlemen, is really very extraordinary. But the past and the present are different things: BARON DIMSDALE may now find it more convenient to be on good terms with Dr. Walley, and I should not wonder to hear, that overtures were made to the latter for a reconciliation. Should this be the case, I doubt not but Dr. Walley would behave on the occasion (as I hope I should in similar circumstances) with the spirit of a man, the politeness of a gentleman, and the forgiveness of a Christian.

BARON DIMSDALE thinks the reasons I gave in my *Observations*, for chusing to say little on the subject of Inoculation, when I was in his company in 1778, "*the most awkward ones he ever heard.* †" The reason, for there was but one, was, that "Dr. Watkinson's opposition to his sentiments was mentioned by him with such evident displeasure,

* As BARON DIMSDALE denies having any private animosity with Dr. Walley; what can his refusal to consult with him be attributed to? The BARON, whose medical education was so much inferior to Dr. Walley's, will not surely presume to decide upon the Doctor's medical abilities.

† *Review*, p. 17.

“ that I should have deemed it rudeness to have
 “ told him in his own house, that I entertained
 “ the same opinions as his antagonist *.”

For my own part, I can see no *awkwardness* in this reason. A person who neither was, nor wished to be at variance with another, particularly one for whom he had a real regard, would surely not enlarge on a subject obviously disagreeable, especially when enlargement was unnecessary, and totally unlikely to produce any advantage.

But BARON DIMSDALE denies, that the subject of Inoculation was then obviously disagreeable to him, and even goes further, and “ declares, *upon his word* †, that Dr. Watkinson’s opposition to “ his sentiments, was neither at that time, nor at “ any other, mentioned by him with displeasure ;” and asserts that “ I had no reason to suppose a conversation on the subject would have been disagreeable to him.” This point, “ in case I “ should persist in what I have asserted, he leaves “ to be decided by the opinion of every individual “ concerning our respective veracities ‡.”

The attentive peruser of the preceding pages, has possibly by this time fixed a standard in his own mind for judging of the BARON’S veracity ; but putting his veracity and mine both out of the question, there is a strong presumptive proof of the truth of my assertion: What is said in print, will naturally be said in conversation, *from the fullness of the heart the mouth speaketh* ; and for the manner in which the BARON has mentioned Dr. Watkinson in print, the reader is referred to his

* *Review*, p. 16. and *Observations*, p. 23.

† *Ibid.* p. 17.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 17, 18.

*Observations on Dr. Watkinson's Examination**. The acrimonious language in which BARON DIMSDALE has spoken of the *Society for General Inoculation*, in his printed works, was also sufficient reason, had I had no other, to suppose that conversation on the subject with one of its advocates, would not afford him much pleasure.

He now charges me, in general terms, with advancing, what he had before particularized, a number of what he calls unjust and uncharitable suspicions, and some *untruths*. The readers of our controversy, especially those who are best acquainted with the neighbourhood of Hertford, may judge for themselves, how far my suspicions were unnatural or uncharitable; and of fabricating untruths, I yet remain unconvicted.

"But several other complaints," says BARON DIMSDALE, "have been made, that I have no thing to do with; such as circulating severe censures on his conduct, &c. p. 6. and a number of unaccountable insinuations from p. 28. to the end.

"On these I shall only remark, that if he means to insinuate, that I have directly, or indirectly, made any such reflections, or have been concerned in propagating them, I must tell him it is absolutely false; if others have done so, he

* Dr. Sims, who innocently rectified some misconstructions respecting the bills of mortality, without once mentioning the BARON's name, as well as Dr. Watkinson, comes in for a share of the BARON's polite treatment, for he is very polite to all those who have the effrontery to dissent in opinion from him; he charges one or the other with "abstruse reasoning; parade of learning; mistaken assertions and delusive reasoning; compilers management; artfully availing; artifice; delusive tables; sophistry; manoeuvre; notorious falsity." See p. 17. 19, 20, 21. 24. 33. 51. 52. 55. 91. 114. 117.

“ should call those to account who have offended ;
 “ if they are his own mistaken apprehensions, he
 “ ought to be ashamed of them *.”

If BARON DIMSDALE had nothing to do with these complaints, it may be properly asked, for what purpose he mentioned them. The insinuations, mentioned p. 6. of my *Observations*, respecting my meanness and presumption, in pretending to an acquaintance when none subsisted, were not mistaken apprehensions of mine, but well known realities, which I declared that I should treat with deserved contempt. That he was concerned directly, or indirectly, in making or propagating them, I never said ; and if any other person has said so, it may, for any thing I know to the contrary, be absolutely false : but I hope he will not assert, that he himself has not obliquely accused me of such meanness and presumption in his printed *Remarks*.

My number of insinuations, as he calls them, p. 28. to the end, whether unaccountable or not, was nothing more than a recapitulation, like his in p. 8. of his *Review*, of circumstances previously adverted to.

The *Ware* Inoculation is now called in question ; and here I am charged with absurdity for saying, that precautions or restrictions would have been absurd in a place already full of contagion. Here, if my meaning has been mistaken, I must beg leave to explain it. I meant then, that in a large town where the smallpox raged with severe fatality, the accession made to the general mass of contagion, by the inoculation of one hundred persons, must be so inconsiderable, that it would have been absurd for those who had not taken precautions before, to

* *Review*, p. 19.

have taken any on that occasion. Precaution is a word of large comprehension, but some of its meanings, and those perhaps of most importance in the case in question, I specified—No persons, I said, as I was credibly informed, quitted the town, or confined themselves to their houses *.

But the BARON declares, that “whatever I may “have been credibly informed of,” what he has written, he can safely assert of his own knowledge. —Here, to preclude all advantage from subterfuge or evasion, it behoves me to see what he has written. In his *Remarks*, p. 13, he declares, that “this Inoculation was conducted exactly in the “same manner that he has recommended in his “writings; and that such as were unwilling to “submit to the operation, took *all possible care* to “avoid intercourse with the infected.”

With regard to the matters of preparation, operation, and management, the fact is readily admitted: the practitioners in his neighbourhood, as in many other places, are well acquainted with his mode of practice, and usually adopt it. With regard to the matter of precaution, if he expects what he can safely assert of his own knowledge should be believed, *viz.* that such as were unwilling to submit to the operation, took *all possible care* to avoid intercourse with the infected, he should descend to particulars, and specify the precautions that were taken. What he can safely assert of his own knowledge may, I believe, in part, be as safely denied. The objectors to the operation, he says, took *all possible* precautions; now quitting the town was certainly a *possible* precaution, but on the strictest inquiry, I cannot find it was taken by any one person during the Ware Inoculation. “But that I might be perfectly

* *Observations*, p. 25.

“clear,”

“ clear,” says the BARON, “ in this point, the whole paragraph was shewn to the gentleman who inoculated and had the care of the people, before publication, and he approved of every part of it.” What a man could safely assert of his own knowledge, he had surely no occasion to apply to another to be clear in ; but waving this, it does not appear how the matter could be better ascertained by that gentleman, than by any other inhabitant of Ware. His business was with his inoculated patients, not with those who refused the operation ; he could have no right to impose restrictions on them, nor does there seem any great probability of his interference even in advising them to use precautions. The whole matter must indeed have been voluntary. Those of the uninoculated who had a proper sense of their danger and concern for their safety, would undoubtedly take what care they could during the prevalence of the natural disease, as well as during the process of the artificial one : those on the contrary who were not terrified by a malignant disease, of which people were dying daily, would scarcely experience any terrors from the sound of the word inoculation. The gentleman, however, who inoculated the Ware patients has been applied to by letter, and has obligingly communicated such information as he was able to communicate. As has been hinted, his concern was not with the uninoculated, and therefore respecting them he can say no more, than that he does not recollect seeing any of them abroad, but he knows nothing of their quitting the town, or taking any other precautions.

By other persons I have been informed that they heard not of any precautions at that period, and firmly believe that none existed ; and further, that whenever the natural smallpox has prevailed in the

the town, the inhabitants have in general been remarkable for a more than common degree of carelessness in neglecting to shun the infection, or, in the vulgar phrase, were noted for running one among another. A circumstance which renders it very improbable that they should pay regard to any prohibition or prohibitions in the case of an inoculation, had such prohibitions or restrictions been really imposed.

The old story of that most unlucky complimentary paragraph, which began the dispute, is now once again revived.

“ To conclude : I believe the present occasion
 “ will sufficiently shew the impropriety of intro-
 “ ducing private character in the discussion of a
 “ public question. Indeed, where the name of a
 “ gentleman of character is introduced, a respect-
 “ ful epithet may be properly annexed, or some
 “ short tribute of gratitude paid, where a bene-
 “ ficial correspondence is noticed, and this seems
 “ to me all that is proper ; for whether I am en-
 “ titled to the very flattering character the Doc-
 “ tor once bestowed on me, or deserve the abuse
 “ he has now thought proper to load me with,
 “ affords no sort of strength to the arguments for
 “ or against the propriety of the practice of the
 “ Society for General Inoculation. * ”

The BARON here seems to allow of the procedure, which in other places he has so severely condemned ; he admits that a respectful epithet may be given : I gave him, by implication, the respectful epithets of a gentleman, and a skilful physician ; but I did no more ; I did not even credit him with benefits derived from his correspondence, for I was not conscious of deriving any. Whether he is entitled to what he calls the flattering cha-

* *Review*, p. 20.

ractions I have bestowed on him, or deserves what he terms the abuse with which I have loaded him, certainly affords no strength to the arguments for or against the practice of the Society, any further than, if the latter be the case, what is deducted from the importance of the opponent, may add to the reputation of the cause. To acquit myself, however, of inconsistency, in bestowing the aforesaid flattering character, or imposing the aforesaid abuse, I must remark, that when I praised, respect, and perhaps partiality, dictated my praise; I thought I knew the man; but in the spirit of conviction, I now own myself mistaken.

“ It occurs to me, however, to mention, that
 “ the document concerning the behaviour of gentlemen of the law, which the Doctor thought
 “ unnecessary, appears to me now to have been
 “ more necessary than I was then aware; and I
 “ mean so far to observe it on my own part, as to pay
 “ all due and impartial attention to whatever Dr.
 “ Lettsom may favour the public with, either on
 “ smallpox, or any other branch of medicine, and
 “ shall think myself obliged to him for any useful
 “ publication *.”

The above document may, indeed, now appear more necessary than the BARON was aware of.— If it had appeared as necessary when he wrote the disclaiming paragraph in his *Remarks* †, a controversy might have been prevented, in which it will probably be thought he has obtained no honour. I am, however, obliged to him for that impartial attention, which he declares he will pay to any publication of mine on *Smallpox*, or any other branch of *Medicine*. I think I may venture to say, notwithstanding all that has passed, he shall

* *Review*, p. 20, 21.

† Pages 15, 16.

not find me behind hand with him in courtesy in that, or on proper concessions in any other respect. I hope ever to contend with spirit, and forgive with readiness.

The BARON, in the conclusion of his *Review*, professes a tender regard for the poor; but it should be considered how far his practice corresponds with his professions. This tender regard is surely not evinced, by endeavouring to deprive them of a benefit, which he himself is every day conferring on the rich; nor can he sincerely think that the inoculation of the former is more likely to extend contagion, than the inoculation of the latter. He surely will not assert, that the danger of communication is as the inverse of the price paid for the operation; that an inoculated pauper is a very hazardous object to the community; that, when five guineas are given, the hazard is diminished, that ten will reduce it yet more, and that by fifty it will be totally annihilated.

He thinks the practice of the Society is big with mischief, and that it tends to continue and spread the disease universally *. In support of this opinion he says, he has published his reasons, and they remain unanswered. Perhaps he has not seen a pamphlet lately published †, in which most of his objections are fully considered and obviated. I may now inform him, that notice will also soon be taken of his arguments, by his original opponent, the ingenious Dr. Watkinson.

* *Remarks*, p. 21.

† Intituled, *A Letter to J. C. Lettsom, M. D. &c.* occasioned by BARON DIMSDALE'S *Remarks on Dr. Lettsom's Letter, &c.* 8vo, Murray. See also the list of pieces on the same subject at the end of this pamphlet.

Nothing now remains for animadversion but the BARON's very extraordinary note at the conclusion of his *Review*.

" P. 28. l. 5. Dr. Lettsom says—' Some have
" imagined, that my waiting on Dr. Walley this
" afternoon, was a circumstance that deprived me
" of his good opinion.' And in note, p. 29. ' Some
" of my friends have suggested, that in spite of all
" appearances, my being an active member of the
" Society for General Inoculation, rendered me
" secretly disagreeable to the Baron.'

" Now I shall be extremely obliged to Dr. Lettsom, if he will inform me of the names of these friends, to whom I am obliged for these suggestions."

To this I shall only reply, that these imaginations and suggestions, were the imaginations and suggestions of real persons; but whatever obligation it might confer on BARON DIMSDALE, I do not think myself at liberty to disclose the names of my friends, who, when they gave me an opinion, had undoubtedly their reasons for giving it. Whatever may be the case with him, I have no wish that this disagreeable controversy should extend beyond ourselves.

APPENDIX.

A P P E N D I X.

IN the 6th page of BARON DIMSDALE's *Review*, he charges me with "collecting many anecdotes of *Omiiah*, and without the least apology, furnishing a monthly publication * with a long letter, *reciting the conversation that had passed at his table.*" Of this letter the following is a copy, extracted from the *London Magazine* for 1774. When the reader considers that this relation was communicated soon after *Omiiah*'s arrival, he will make allowances for any historical inaccuracies.

Genuine Account of Omiiah, a Native of Otaheite, a new discovered Island in the South Seas, lately brought over to England by Capt. Fourneaux.

AS your useful miscellany is read by many persons of curiosity and taste, I shall take the liberty of acquainting you with the result of a

* " *Monthly Ledger*, vol. 2. p. 18. *Annual Register*, 1774." And likewise in the *London Magazine*, which containing the fullest relation, has induced me to prefer it,

visit I paid to a friend of mine at Hertford, at whose house I dined in company with Omiah.

I am five feet ten inches and a half high, and the first time I was introduced into Omiah's company, by his interpreter, Mr. Andrews *, I took an opportunity of measuring in height with this polite stranger. This freedom pleased Omiah much, as does every circumstance in which he can engage with a person either in conversation or in action. He is about half an inch under my size, but rather lusty, and strong made, though not in the least heavy. His complexion much resembles that of an European accustomed to hot climates; his features are regular, and agreeable by a smile, which the pleasures he enjoys seem to produce. His hair is jet black, shining and strong, and clubbed behind, since he came over; he was dressed in a reddish-brown coat and breeches, with a white waistcoat, made in the English taste, in which he appeared perfectly easy. His hands are *tataowed*, according to the mode in his native country: it is usual there to mark the right hand in a particular manner, upon occasion of taking a wife; and Omiah, whom I imagine to be about eighteen years old, has been honoured with eight or ten sets of these marks, having already had as many wives. He is also marked, or *tataowed*, in some other parts; but they are hidden by his clothes.

I saw him at Baron Dimisdale's, at whose house I had the pleasure of dining with him, he being then at Hertford, under preparation previous to inoculation for the smallpox, and which he hath since safely passed through.

* This gentleman was the surgeon of Capt. Fourneaux's vessel.

In company he is easy and polite, and behaves so at table ; handles his knife and fork very well, and conducts himself in every respect with great decency, cleanliness, and void of any awkwardness. As he was confined to a certain regimen, he ate only of pudding, potatoes, and other vegetables, though he is fond of meat, and particularly of ham ; but, with regard to quantity, he is very abstemious.

Oemiah is so far from shewing such marks of simplicity and ignorance, as have been mentioned in the different accounts of him, (published in the newspapers) that his deportment is genteel, and resembles so much that of well-bred people here, as to make it appear very extraordinary to those who know how little a time it is since he left the South-sea Islands, where the manners are so totally different from those of the polished people in Europe.

A few common expressions he pronounces with fluency, such as, " How do you do ?" &c *. As the whole language of an Otaheitan, which is the same as that of the natives of Ulateah, does not exceed a thousand words, he is extremely at a loss for terms to express the new ideas he has acquired, and objects he has seen in this country. As those southern people have only three quadrupeds, the dog, the rat, and the hog †, he has no term for describing a horse, but by that of " a great hog " that carries people ;" or a cow, by that of " a great hog that gives milk," &c.

* When presented to the king, it was in these words Oemiah saluted him.

† Does not this circumstance evince, that these islands were peopled, and furnished with their stock of animals by some vessel formerly wrecked upon these coasts,

The fruits in these southern islands are almost equally limited in number; and nothing affords Omiah more amusement than a garden, and the fruit on the trees against the walls. The plants and shrubberies for ornament, he says, he would take away, and replace them with others that bear something to eat.

When he first saw a house, it was matter of astonishment, as it must naturally prove to a person who had never seen any thing but sheds, and low covered rooms. Carriages drawn by horses were also wonderful to him once; but now he sees them without any marks of surprise.

In the southern isles abovementioned, no person is buried, but laid to rot above ground in a *Moral*. The other day, Omiah was at a funeral at Hertford; but he was incapable of seeing it finished: he wept upon the occasion, and went from so painful a scene. When he first saw the churchyard at Hertford, and was told that people were buried in it, he asked if all the people buried there had died by inoculation.

He evidently has an affable, as well as a tender disposition; he possesses likewise much discernment and quickness. A mark of sensibility he shewed very lately. He was observing some anglers fishing near Hertford, and was pleased to learn in what manner they were employed; but, when he saw the hooks baited with a live worm, he turned away to avoid a sight so disagreeable, and declared his antipathy to eat any fish taken by so cruel a method. An instance of his discernment and quickness he exhibited when he was introduced to the Duchess of Gloucester, previous to his going to Hertford. The Duchess not being prepared with a present proper for Omiah, it occurred to her, that

that a pocket handkerchief, embellished with her coronet, might be acceptable to him : it was presented to him : Omiah immediately kissed the coronet, and made a most complaisant bow to the Duchess. As this mark of his attention, politeness, and quickness, was unexpected, it gained him the good graces of all present.

Similar to this, Omiah distinguished himself when he was introduced to Lord Sandwich. He first pointed to the butler, and said, " He was king of the bottles;" that Capt. Fourneaux " was king of the ship;" but Lord Sandwich " was king of all the ships."

I mentioned that he had several wives; some of which, however, he relinquished on account of their sterility. Some he still retains; but he intimated, when I inquired of him about the subject, that although he was happy in England, yet he should certainly be happier had he a wife in this country also. Capt. Fourneaux took up Omiah from Ulateah; but his father, who is a man of very great consequence, owns large possessions in Otaheite, as well as in that island, and Omiah was born at Otaheite, where he had seen Mr. Banks and Dr. Solander, and knew them again when he arrived here. He was designed for the priesthood; and his friends, who entertained the highest esteem for him, used every argument they could suggest against his venturing with Capt. Fourneaux: they observed, that none of their friends had ever been brought back—that they had certainly been killed and eaten*; in which they were confirmed by seeing

* It is a melancholy fact, that cannibals exist. When Captains Cook and Fourneaux lay off New Zealand, near Cook's straits,

seeing some salted beef on board the English ships; for, as these natives had never seen any quadrupeds, except those I have enumerated, they were persuaded the salted meat could not be any of them, and therefore must have been human. They said likewise, that these ships sailed from place to place, and thus the sailors supported themselves among the islands, for that they had not any home of their own. But all these tremendous suggestions had no effect upon Omiah; he was resolved to die, or know the truth for himself.

Perhaps, if the history of his countrymen be considered, the doubts that must naturally be presented to him, and the circumstances of his independence, family, and popularity, there is not in any history of the world a much greater instance of resolution, intrepidity, and curiosity, if a parallel, to what Omiah has evinced.

London, Aug. 11.

APYREXIA.

Let the reader now judge *how much* of "the conversation that passed at the table of BARON DIMSDALE, when *Omiah* and myself were present," has been recited in the preceding letter:

straits, which divides this country into two islands, a boat was manned with eleven men, armed by Capt. Fourneaux's vessel, who were sent on shore; but they never returned. The next day another boat was manned, and at a cave near these straits they found some of the limbs, shoes, and heads of some of their murdered and eaten fellow-seamen; but they could never discover the boat. This so enraged the survivors, that they fired upon a large number of natives gathered on the shore, and killed about eighteen before the rest dispersed.

With

With all the improvements which have of late been introduced in the management of the small-pox, it is a melancholy truth, that this disease still continues to be one of the most fatal scourges of the human race; not less than fifty persons have been carried off by it, in the metropolis, every week for some months past. If, by the united aid of the Faculty, some new lights may be thrown upon the disease, with respect to either its prevention or cure, I shall think myself amply compensated for the trouble I have taken in circulating the following letter, which I shall insert with a view of promoting these important designs.

WHEN it is considered that the smallpox is one of the chief causes of depopulation, and that, in London alone, one hundred and seven thousand one hundred and fifty persons have been carried off by it within the last fifty years; Inoculation seems to have been providentially introduced, to disarm the natural disease of its malignant power—to promote the increase of mankind, secure the preservation of individuals, and lessen the sum of human misery.

When it is further considered, that scarcely one in five hundred die in the Inoculated Smallpox, we cannot but lament over the loss of those one hundred and seven thousand one hundred and fifty victims, most of whom might have been redeemed from the grave, and, by the probable increase of their offspring, have made an immense addition to the strength of the state.

The means of counteracting the ravages of this fatal distemper by Inoculation, have been very generally

nerally embraced by the higher classes of people in this nation; but, to a very useful, and the most numerous part of the community, the advantages resulting from it have hitherto in great measure been lost, either from the confined circumstances of the poor, or from their prejudices against so extraordinary an innovation in practice.

At length, however, examples of the dreadful effects of the natural, and the wonderful success of the artificial disease, have overcome these ill-founded prejudices, and nothing seemed wanting, to enable the poor to reap the benefit of this practice, but an establishment suited to their condition and circumstances.

In London alone upwards of ten thousand children annually die under seven years of age, a great part of whom fall victims to the natural smallpox; but, till very lately, the poor had no means of avoiding this disease by Inoculation, as no institution for that purpose existed here till the year 1775, when the Society for General Inoculation of the Poor was first established.

To humane and benevolent minds, it must have afforded a high degree of pleasure, to see such ample means extended for saving the offspring of the poor; and that their avidity to embrace this salutary practice was exceeded only by the success of it: for hitherto not a single unfavourable event has taken place; nor has any instance occurred to the medical practitioners engaged in this institution, to prove that the infection has been propagated from an inoculated patient.

But though success has thus removed the prejudices of the lower class of people, and increased their desire for Inoculation, there are, however, indivi-

individuals, whose opposition to so benevolent an institution has been proportionally augmented ; and much labour has been employed to prove, that whilst the Inoculation of the rich at their own houses, is a laudable practice, it is highly injurious to the community, when introduced among the poor. The poor, however, though slow in admitting new improvements, are not soon to be reasoned out of self-evident facts ; and their willingness to try Inoculation, continues to augment with the success of the practice.

Positions, however, though ever so repugnant to experience, when advanced by persons of acknowledged ability in their profession, will have some influence on those individuals, from whose approbation and bounty every useful institution must derive its stability. It, therefore, behoves every friend of the poor, to oppose facts to bare assertions, when the interests of so useful a part of the community are in danger of being essentially injured.

Hence it is that this appeal is made to the Faculty, and other persons acquainted with the comparative effects of the natural and artificial disease, in hopes of acquiring such further information, as may more fully ascertain the sum of good and evil consequent on each ; and they are respectively requested to answer as many of the following queries as come within the compass of their personal experience.

I. At what periods of time is the natural Small-pox most prevalent or fatal ?

F 2

II. In

- II. In those places, where the Smallpox appears at certain intervals, has Inoculation been known to propagate the disease during such intervals?
- III. What distempers appear to have been the consequences of the natural, and what of the artificial Smallpox?
- IV. After the natural disease has broke out in any particular district or quarter of a town, has the practice of Inoculation appeared to stop the progress of the infection, or has it accelerated it?
- V. Has Inoculation been practised in any particular district or quarter of a town, without extending the infection to other parts?
- VI. At what period of life are people most likely to pass through Inoculation with the least hazard, and at what seasons of the year is the practice most successful?
- VII. After the infection of the Smallpox has been received, can its operation be destroyed by Inoculation?

Communications upon these subjects, or of facts in general, which tend to throw a light upon the natural or artificial disease, must greatly conduce to improvement in this department of medicine; and as it is proposed to reduce them into one general history, now preparing for the press, the favours of correspondents, will then, with their permission, be particularly acknowledged, by the AUTHOR.

After

After inserting the foregoing letter, I cannot avoid acknowledging the satisfaction I have experienced in the correspondence of many ingenious and respectable gentlemen, upon the present subject; and assuring them, that as soon as my publication upon it comes from the press, it shall be immediately sent to them, or left for them at their Booksellers in London.

F I N I S.

The

The following Pamphlets, relative to the principal Subject of the present Controversy, have been lately published.

THOUGHTS on General and Partial Inoculations. By the Honourable Baron Thomas Dimfdale, first Physician and actual Counsellor of State to her Imperial Majesty the Empress of all the Russias, and F. R. S. Octavo, London, 1776. P. p. 70. Price 1s. 6d.

An Examination of a Charge brought against Inoculation by De Haen, Raft, Dimfdale, and other Writers. Octavo, London, 1776. P. p. 46. Price 1s. By John Watkinson, M. D.

Observations on the Introduction to the Plan of the Dispensary for General Inoculation, with Remarks on a Pamphlet, intituled, "An Examination of a Charge, &c." Octavo, London, 1778. P. p. 136. Price 1s. 6d. By the Honourable Baron T. Dimfdale, first Physician, &c.

A Letter to Sir Robert Barker, and George Stacpoole, Esq; upon General Inoculation. Quarto, London, 1778. P. p. 13. Price 6d. By J. C. Lettsom, M. D. F. R. S. and S. A. &c.

Remarks on a Letter to Sir Robert Barker, &c. Octavo, London, 1779. P. p. 16. Price 6d. By the Honourable Baron T. Dimfdale, &c.

Observations on Baron Dimfdale's Remarks on Dr. Lettsom's Letter. Octavo, London, 1779. P. p. 32. Price 6d. By J. C. Lettsom, M. D. &c.
A Letter

A Letter to J. C. Lettsom, M. D. &c. occasioned by Baron Dimisdale's Remarks on Dr. Lettsom's Letter, &c. upon General Inoculation. Octavo, London, 1779. P. p. 39. Price 1 s. By an uninterested Spectator of the Controversy between Baron Dimisdale and Dr. Watkinson on the above-mentioned Subject.

A Review of Dr. Lettsom's Observations on Baron Dimisdale's Remarks respecting Dr. Lettsom's Letter on General Inoculation. Octavo, London, 1779. P. p. 21. By the Honourable Baron T. Dimisdale.

An answer to Baron Dimisdale's Review, &c. Octavo, London. P. p. 48. By J. C. Lettsom, M. D. &c. Price 1 s.

*Also lately published, written by Dr. LETTSOM ;
and sold by C. Dilly, in the Poultry ; and
H. Payne, Pall-Mall.*

REFLECTIONS on the general Treatment and Cure of Fevers. Octavo, 1772. Price 2 s. The second Edition in Press.

The Natural History of the Tea-tree, with Observations on the Medical Qualities of Tea, and effects of Tea-drinking. Quarto, 1772. Price 4 s. The second Edition in Press.

The Naturalist's and Traveller's Companion ; containing Instructions for collecting and preserving Objects of Natural History. Octavo, 1774. The second Edition. Price 2 s. 6 d.

Medical

Medical Memoirs of the General Dispensary in London. Octavo, 1774. Price 4s. The second Edition in Press.

Improvement of Medicine in London, on the Basis of Public Good. Octavo, 1775. Price 1s. 6d.

Observations preparatory to the use of Dr. Mayerbach's Medicines. Octavo, 1776. The second Edition, with an engraving of the Water-doctor from Teniers. Price 1s. 6d.

History of the Origin of Medicine; and of the state of Physic prior to the Trojan War. An Oration delivered before the Medical Society of London. Quarto, 1778. Price 6s.

7 AP 66

Observations on the Plan proposed for establishing a Dispensary and Medical Society, with Formula Medicamentorum Pauperibus præcipue accommodata. Octavo, 1779. Price 1s.

